

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. While Applicant does not agree with this rejection and believes that signal format claims can recite statutory subject matter, these claims have been rejected to expedite prosecution.

The typo in claim 32 has been corrected. The use of “wherein” in claims 2 and 42 is eliminated.

Claims 1, 3, 8-10, 12, 15, 17-23, 26-28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37-41, 43, and 45-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by newly-applied Monroe. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish that a claim is anticipated, the Examiner must point out where each and every limitation in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentec, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Every limitation contained in the claims must be present in the reference, and if even one limitation is missing from the reference, then it does not anticipate the claim. *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 13, 14, 32, 33, and 42. Claim 1 incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 2. Claim 10 incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 13. Claim 27 incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 2. Claim 32 incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 33. Claim 40 incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 42. Accordingly claims 1, 10, 27, 32, and 42 should now be allowed along with their respective dependent claims.

Newly-added independent claims 3, 15, 34, and 43 describe a location area update request message being sent by a mobile radio terminal to a radio access network, and a radio access network sending in response a location update rejection message including information indicating a list of two or more location areas from which the mobile radio terminal may not obtain service. The mobile terminal stores the list of two or more location areas. The mobile checks the list prior to performing a subsequent location area.

In contrast, Monroe simply teaches the network sending a single forbidden area cause code received in response to a location update request from the mobile. See both paragraphs 0048 and 0054 relied on by the Examiner. No list of two or more location areas is sent from the network to the mobile. It is the mobile that stores a forbidden identifier in its SIM card for that location area. Accordingly, all claims 3, 15, 34, and 43 recite features lacking in Monroe.

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100